

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 00536 01 OF 02 311953Z

73

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-07 IO-10

L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05

BIB-01 /088 W

----- 116202

R 311655Z JAN 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 9861

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 0536

1. AT JANUARY 30 SPC MEETING, NETHERLANDS REP (BUWALDA) STATE THAT HIS AUTHORITIES BELIEVE THAT AN EXCHANGE OF DATA NEED NOT BE A PREREQUISITE TO A SATISFACTORY OUTCOME OF THE NEGOTIATIONS. THE NETHERLANDS WISHED TO PROPOSE THAT THE LLIES RECONSIDER THEIR POSITION ON AN EXCHANGE OF DATA, AND CONSIDER POSSIBILITIES OF A DIFFERENT APPROACH. TEXT OF DUTCH PAPER IS AT END OF THIS MESSAGE.

2. THE NETHERLANDS PROPOSES THAT THE SPC REQUEST THE MBFR WORKING GROUP TO CONDUCT A STUDY OF THE MILITARY IMPLICATIONS OF THE APPROACHES STATED IN THE DUTCH PAPER, AND TO REPORT BACK TO THE SPC. THE SPC WOULD THEN CONSIDER WHETHER ANY NEW GUIDANCE TO AHG WERE NECESSARY.

3. SPC WILL CONSIDER THE NETHERLANDS REQUEST ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6.

4. ACTION REQUESTED: MISSION REQUESTS GUIDANCE, IN TIME  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 00536 01 OF 02 311953Z

FOR FEBRUARY 6 SPC MEETING ON: 1) ANY INITIAL U.S. VIEWS WHICH WASHINGTON WISHES US TO MAKE IN SPC ON THE DUTCH PROPOSAL; 2) ANY PARTICULAR POINTS WASHINGTON WOULD LIKE IN THE SPC MANDATE TO THE WORKING GROUP, IF THE SPC

REQUESTS A MILITARY TECHNICAL STUDY FROM THE WG.

5. BEGIN TEXT

1. THE NETHERLANDS ARE OF THE OPINION THAT, IN VIEW OF THE ATTITUDE ADOPTED BY THE WARSAW PACT SO FAR, IT SEEMS HIGHLY UNLIKELY THAT IT WILL BE POSSIBLE TO COME TO AN AGREEMENT ON THE DATA ISSUE AS LONG AS THE WEST STICKS TO ITS DEMAND FOR AN EXCHANGE OF DATA. IN SALT, THE SOVIET UNION HAS ALWAYS REFUSED TO TABLE ITS OWN FIGURES AND IN THE END THEY HAVE IMPLICITLY ACCEPTED THOSE PRESENTED BY THE UNITED STATES. IT IS WELL KNOWN THAT IN EASTERN EUROPE DATA ARE HIGHLY CLASSIFIED AND, IN VIEW OF THE WODESPREAD PREOCCUPATION WITH SECRECY IN COMMUNIST COUNTRIES, IT SEEMS UNREALISTIC FOR US TO EXPECT THEM TO CHANGE THEIR ATTITUDE FOR THE SAKE OF MBFR.

2. MOREOVER, THE QUESTION ARISES WHETHER WESTERN INSISTENCE ON AN EXCHANGE OF DATA IS REALLY ESSENTIAL TO THE AIM THE ALLIES HAVE SET THEMSELVES.

IF SO, THERE IS INDEED EVERY REASON FOR THE ALLIES TO CONTINUE TO URGE

THE WARSAW PACT TO BE MORE FORTHCOMING IN THIS RESPECT. IF NOT, HOWEVER, WE MIGHT ASK OURSELVES WHETHER WAYS CAN BE FOUND TO AVOID THIS DIFFICULTY, THUS REMOVING A POSSIBLE STUMBLING BLOCK.

3. IT OCCURS TO US THAT AN EXCHANGE OF DATA NEED NOT BE A PRE-REQUISITE FOR A SATISFACTORY OUTCOME OF THE NEGOTIATIONS.

THEREFORE, MY AUTHORITIES THINK THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD HAVE ANOTHER LOOK AT THE PRESENT ALLIED POSITION AND CONSIDER THE POSSIBILITIES OF A DIFFERENT APPROACH.

THE TWO FOLLOWING ALTERNATIVES SEEM TO PRESENT THEMSELVES:

4. EITHER,

A. PARTIES REACH AGREEMENT ON REDUCTIONS, BUT THE AGREEMENT DOES NOT EXPLICITLY MENTION THE COMMON CEILING, OR  
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 00536 01 OF 02 311953Z

B. PARTIES DO NOT SPECIFY REDUCTIONS, BUT IN THAT CASE THE AGREEMENT DOES MENTION A COMMON CEILING.

5. IN BOTH CASES ONE COULD ENVISAGE THE FOLLOWING APPROACHES:

(I) NEITHER THE WP NOR THE ALLIES PROVIDE DATA;

(II) THE OTHER SIDE ACCEPTS - EXPLICITLY OR IMPLICITLY - DATA TABLED BY THE WEST;

(III) BOTH SIDES AGREE TO ACCEPT AS A DATA BASE FIGURES FROM OTHER SOURCES SUCH AS THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR STRATEGIC STUDIES (IISS) OR THE STOCKHOLM INTERNATIONAL PEACE RESEARCH

INSTITUTE (SIPRI)

THE LONDON BASED IISS, A WESTERN ORGANISATION, MAY SEEM A  
LESS ATTRACTIVE PROPOSITION TO THE EAST.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 00536 02 OF 02 312026Z

73

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-07 IO-10

L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05

BIB-01 /088 W

----- 116770

R 311655Z JAN 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 9862

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 0536

6. IN THE CASE OF ALTERNATIVE 4 A. - AGREEMENT ON REDUCTIONS,  
BUT NO SPECIFICATION OF A COMMON CEILING - THE FINAL RESULT WILL  
STILL BE SUCH A COMMON CEILING, AS THE WEST WILL CONTINUE TO  
INSIST ON ASYMMETRICAL REDUCTIONS PRECISELY WITH THAT OBJECTIVE  
IN MIND. A POSSIBLE DISADVANTAGE OF THIS ALTERNATIVE COULD BE,  
THAT IT WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO ACCUSE THE OTHER SIDE OF ANY VIO-  
LATION OF THE AGREEMENT SHOULD IT INCREASE ITS FORCES AFTER RE-  
DUCTIONS, BECAUSE THE AGREEMENT DOES NOT MENTION A MAXIMUM POST  
REDUCTION FORCE LEVEL. HOWEVER, IN VIEW OF THE UNCERTAINTY AS  
TO THE POSSIBILITIES OF ARRIVING AT A MEANINGFUL UNDERSTANDING  
WITH THE EAST ON SUCH ISSUES AS VERIFICATION, IT SEEMS DIFFICULT  
AT THIS STAGE TO DETERMINE HOW MUCH  
IMPORTANCE ONE SHOULD ATTACH TO OBJECTIONS OF THIS NATURE.

7. THE ALTERNATIVE OUTLINED UNDER 4B., WHEREBY A COMMON CEILING IS  
WRITTEN INTO THE AGREEMENT, AVOIDS THIS DIFFICULTY.  
THIS ALTERNATIVE SEEMS TO HAVE THE ADDED ADVANTAGE THAT IT CONCEALS  
THE DISPARITY IN REDUCTIONS TO BE CARRIED OUT BY EITHER SIDE.

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 00536 02 OF 02 312026Z

ONLY THE FINAL RESULT IS SPECIFIED AND NOT THE  
DISTANCE OF THE ROAD TO GET  
THERE. THIS "CAMOUFLAGE" MAY BE VALUABLE IN VIEW OF THE WARSAW  
PACT'S OPPOSITION TO ASYMMETRICAL REDUCTIONS.

8. THE CONSIDERATIONS SET OUT ABOVE HAVE LED US TO THE CONCLUSION  
THAT IT WOULD BE A GOOD THING FOR THE ALLIANCE TO HAVE ANOTHER  
LOOK AT THE DTATA PROBLEM.

OBVIOUSLY, AN AUTHORITATIVE VIEW ON THE MILITARY IMPLICATIONS OF  
THE VARIOUS APPROACHES WOULD BE OF GREAT HELP TO THE MEMBERS OF  
THE SPC WHEN THEY DISCUSS THIS SUBJECT. WE WOULD, THEREFORE,  
PROPOSE THAT THE SPC ASK THE WORKING GROUP TO STUDY THESE SUG-  
GESTIONS AND TO SUBMIT A REPORT ON ITS FINDINGS.

9. AT A LATER STAGE, WHEN CAPITALS HAVE HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO  
CONSIDER THE FINDINGS OF THE MILITARY EXPERTS, THE SPC CLULD COME  
BACK TO THE PROBLEM OF DATA AND SEE WHETHER WE SHOULD ASK THE AD  
HOC GROUP TO INVESTIGATE THE POSSIBILITIES OF A MEANINGFUL DIS-  
CUSSION WITH THE OTHER SIDE ON THE DATA ISSUE IF THE WEST  
DROPPED ITS DEMAND FOR WARSAW PACT FIGURES.

ON THE BASIS OF THE AD HOC GROUP'S ADVICE, THE ALLIES SHOULD THEN  
DETERMINE WHETHER TO INTRODUCE ONE OF THESE ALTERNATIVES INTO THE  
NEGOTIATIONS.

END TEXT

BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 18 AUG 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 31 JAN 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975NATO00536  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** N/A  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19750188/abbrzhxw.tel  
**Line Count:** 193  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 02 APR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <02 APR 2003 by MartinML>; APPROVED <03 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
05 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** n/a  
**TAGS:** n/a  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO BONN  
LONDON  
MBFR VIENNA  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006